

REMARKS

Claims 1-70, as amended, remain herein. Claims 1, 3, 7, 34, and 40 have been amended to recite “at least two times” and “at predetermined intervals.” This amendment is responsive to the previous Office Action, and should place this application fully in condition for allowance.

Applicant's attorney, Mr. Watkins, thanks Examiner Nguyen for the courtesy of the interview conducted on September 12, 2005. Applicant's attorney argued that that the cited portions of the Fan reference did not disclose activity at “predetermined” times or intervals. The Examiner cited Fan, col. 15, lines 40-50, for the disclosure of “periodic” and “once every month.” Applicant's attorney argued that the above disclosure related to setting periodic activity based upon changes in degradation effect, *e.g.*, faster degradation would lead to more frequent checks, whereas slower degradation would lead to less frequent checks. Thus, the multiple processing was not predetermined.

The Examiner said he would reconsider the rejection of those claims that recite both “at least two times” and “periodic intervals,” that he believed that our arguments overcame the rejection, but that he wanted to conduct a further search.

The Examiner also stated that he might reconsider his position on claims 1, 3, 7, 34 and 40 if they were amended to recite the “at least two times” and “predetermined intervals” limitations. Such reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

1. Claims 1-8, 13-22, 34-41, 43-55, and 68-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Fan U.S. Pat. 6,097,356.

Each of independent claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 20, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 53 recites changing the luminescence value at least two times at predetermined intervals. In the Interview Summary from the interview conducted September 12, 2005, the Examiner notes that Fan at column 15, lines 41-47, discloses “one has to measure the emission characteristics periodically... and re-measured.” This disclosure from Fan relates to setting periodic activity based upon changes in degradation effect, *e.g.*, faster degradation would lead to more frequent checks, whereas slower degradation would lead to less frequent checks. But, while Fan’s multiple processing may be periodic, it was not predetermined. Nothing in the cited portion of Fan, or Fan in its entirety, teaches or suggests changing the luminescence value at least two times at predetermined intervals as recited in the applicant’s claims.

As discussed in applicant’s specification beginning at page 46, line 14, some image pixels can degrade faster than others, particularly when the display is in use for long periods. Even if (1) all the pixels are driven with the same voltage and (2) correction is implemented using a correction table, pixels with advanced degradation will not be as bright as other pixels. The presently claimed invention reduces these effects by, *inter alia*, carrying out a correction “at least two times at predetermined intervals.” Fan fails even to appreciate this problem, let alone teach or suggest its solution.

Accordingly, Fan does not disclose or suggest all elements of applicants' independent claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 20, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 53, and dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 13-19, 21, 22, 35, 37, 39, 43-52, 54, and 68-70, all of which are patentably distinct over Fan. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all claims are therefore respectfully requested.

2. Dependent claims 9-12 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fan in view of Ando et al. ("Ando"), U.S. Pat. 4,672,275. Dependent claims 24-33 and 55-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fan in view of Howard et al. ("Howard"), U.S. Pat. 6,023,259. Claims 23 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fan in view of Xie et al. ("Xie"), U.S. Pat. 6,025,819. The additional citations of Ando, Howard and Xie do not supply what is lacking from Fan as disclosed above. These dependent claims are therefore patentably distinct over the cited prior art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the Fan reference. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Fan, Ando, Howard, or Xie which would suggest the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims and allowance of same are therefore respectfully requested.

Any amendments to the claims not specifically argued to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art have been made for clarity, a purpose unrelated to patentability.

Accordingly, the application is now in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 28951.3110). If a

Applicant: Toru KAWASE et al.
Appln. Serial No.: 10/089,802

Attorney's Docket No.: 28951.3110

telephone conference would be of value, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Parkhurst', written over the printed name.

Roger W. Parkhurst, Reg. No. 25,177
Tyson Y. Winarski, Reg. No. 41,381

Date: September 20, 2005
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-429-3000
Fax: 202-429-3902